

MADHYA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION, BHOPAL

Sub : In the matter of petition for permission under Section 43, 47(1)&(5) and 50 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for providing supply at more than one point in the installation of M/s Ipca Laboratories Ltd.

Petition No. 41/2012

ORDER

(Date of hearing 25th June, 2012)

(Date of order 26th June, 2012)

M/s Ipca Laboratories Ltd.,
Post Sejavta, PB No. 33,
Mhow-Neemuch Road, Ratlam. - Petitioner

V/s

M.P.Paschim Kshetra Vidyut Vitaran Co. Ltd. - Respondent No.1
GPH Compound, Pologround,
Indore (MP).

The Chief Engineer (Electrical & Safety) - Respondent No.2
Electrical Inspectorate, GoMP
3rd Floor, Satpura Bhawan, Bhopal

Shri R.S.Goyal, Consultant and Shri R.C.Somani, Consultant appeared on behalf of the Petitioner.

Shri Pavan Kumar Jain, Add. SE appeared on behalf of the Respondent No.1.

Shri S.S.Mujalde, CE (Electrical & Safety) and Shri A.K.Dubey, SE (ES) & Dy. Chief Electrical Inspector appeared on behalf of the Respondent No.2.

2. The petitioner has filed the petition in the matter of availing supply at more than one point in the premises of M/s Ipca Laboratories Ltd., Ratlam.

3. The petitioner has an HT connection with a contract demand of 7300 KVA at 33 KV. Tariff Schedule HV 3.1 is applicable to the petitioner. The petitioner has submitted that no space is available for future expansion in its existing HT yard. Hence, an additional power transformer has been installed at the back of the factory by laying the 33 KV overhead cables about 550 meters long. The 33 KV line is passing overhead from existing HT yard to the rear HT yard and in between these lines there are chemical plants which creates hazardous and unsafe condition for the workers

(cont. to next page)

Sub : In the matter of petition for permission under Section 43, 47(1)&(5) and 50 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for providing supply at more than one point in the installation of M/s Ipca Laboratories Ltd.

and increases potential risk of major fire. In order to avoid any hazards, the petitioner has requested that they be provided additional point of supply in the existing premises. The petitioner has submitted that after availing additional point of supply, they will get the 33 KV overhead cables disconnected. Further, the petitioner is ready to bear the cost of lines etc. for availing the additional point of supply.

4. The petitioner has, therefore, prayed for one additional point of supply on the existing premises due to safety reasons and as well as technical problem of installation of additional power transformer in existing switchyard.

5. The case was listed for motion hearing on 12.06.2012. The petitioner reiterated the contents of the petition and requested for supply at more than one point so that they can dismantle the existing overhead cable. They have also submitted that the total contract demand would remain the same.

6. During the hearing on 12.06.2012, the Commission enquired from the petitioner whether the requisite permission from Electrical Inspectorate for laying of overhead cable within the premises was obtained. If so, whether or not the Inspectorate objected to the contended risk? The representative of the petitioner stated that required permission for laying the overhead cable was obtained from Electrical Inspectorate. However, he could not respond to the other query.

7. The Commission admitted the petition and directed that notices be issued to the Chief Electrical Inspector, Government of MP and the respondent company. The next date of hearing was fixed for 25.06.2012.

8. During the hearing on 25.06.2012, representative of the respondent No.2 submitted that the petitioner has obtained the required permission for laying the overhead cable from the Electrical Inspectorate and the petitioner is following the safety rules accordingly.

9. During the hearing, the Commission enquired from the petitioner as to why the

(cont. to next page)

Sub : In the matter of petition for permission under Section 43, 47(1)&(5) and 50 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for providing supply at more than one point in the installation of M/s Ipca Laboratories Ltd.

supply is required at more than one point if there is no safety hazard. The representative of the petitioner submitted that there is a problem of space required for installation of additional transformer. However, he could not respond to the other query.

10. During the hearing, the representative of respondent No.1 submitted that the request of the petitioner is contrary to the provisions of Clause 5.2 of the MP Electricity Supply Code, 2004 and therefore, the petition deserves to be dismissed.

11. On hearing the petitioner and the respondents, the Commission observes that as informed by the respondent No.2, the overhead cable has been laid with due permission following prescribed safety rules. The contention of the petitioner of safety hazard is not sustainable. The Commission has also noted that clause 5.2 of the MP Electricity Supply Code, 2004 provides that the supply shall be given at a single point in the premises. The Commission is, therefore, of the view that the petition is not maintainable as it lacks justification and is inconsistent with the provisions of MP Electricity Supply Code, 2004.

12. In view of the above, the petition No. 41 of 2012 stands dismissed.

Ordered accordingly,

sd/-
(C.S.Sharma)
Member

sd/-
(Rakesh Sahni)
Chairman